

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/440,645	11/16/1999	AVERY FONG	5244-0109-2	3214
22850	7590 03/27/200	6	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D	
	IA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2152	

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

··········		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/440,645	FONG ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Victor Lesniewski	2152
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		·	
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Ja</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro	
Dispositi	on of Claims	•	
5) □ 6) ⊠ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati	Claim(s) 1,5-10,14-19,23-28 and 32-36 is/are page 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1,5-10,14-19,23-28 and 32-36 is/are raction claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrections.	vn from consideration.  rejected.  r election requirement.  r.  repted or b) □ objected to by the following(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
12) [ a) [	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
2) Notice 3) Information	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 10/26/5 & 12/19/5	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P	

Art Unit: 2152

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. The amendment filed 1/3/2006 has been placed of record in the file.
- 2. Claims 25, 26, 28, and 35 have been amended.
- 3. The objections to the informalities in the claims are withdrawn in view of the amendment.
- 4. The rejection of claims 28 and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is withdrawn in view of the amendment.
- 5. Claims 1, 5-10, 14-19, 23-28, and 32-36 are now pending.
- 6. The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-10, 14-19, 23-28, and 32-36 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. A detailed discussion is set forth below.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

7. The IDS filed 10/26/2005 and the IDS filed 12/19/2005 have been considered.

#### Response to Amendment

8. Claims 25, 26, 28, and 35 have been amended to correct informalities and a lack of antecedent basis issue in the claims. The amendments do not prove a change in scope to the limitations of the claims.

## Claim Rejections

Page 3

- 9. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 28, 34, and 35 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyachi (U.S. Patent Number 6,108,492) as presented in the previous rejection dated 10/3/2005.
- 10. Claims 5, 6, 9, 14, 15, 18, 23, 24, 27, 32, 33, and 36 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi in view of Aikens et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,414,494) as presented in the previous rejection dated 10/3/2005.

### Response to Arguments

- 11. In the remarks, the applicant has argued:
  - <Argument 1>
     Miyachi does not disclose the features of the independent claims because he does not disclose "monitoring data of selecting of the plurality of operations of the operation panel by the user" and the like as recited in the independent claims.
- 12. In response to argument 1, it is maintained that Miyachi discloses the monitoring of the selecting of operations as claimed. The previous line citation, column 5, lines 57-65, clearly states that the multifunction peripheral's processor monitors the condition of the multifunction peripheral and updates status information. These conditions are set forth in Table 1, as previously cited, and include a plurality of operations selected by a user at the operation panel. In support of the argument the applicant has stated that "Miyachi does not disclose or suggest any monitoring of buttons on an operation panel of an image forming device that a user selects" in paragraph 3 of page 9 of the remarks and again that "at no point does Miyachi disclose or

Art Unit: 2152

suggest monitoring which button switches are selected by a user" in paragraph 1 of page 10 of the remarks. First, it is noted that the monitoring of buttons as argued by the applicant is not a limitation of the claims. The applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, even if the monitoring step was qualified specifically toward a monitoring of buttons, Miyachi teaches such monitoring as his system clearly monitors the user input (or operation panel) and takes action based on a user's entry to the user input. See column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 3.

- 13. Although not a limitation of the claims, the applicant has pointed out that the "operations" in the present invention relate to such operations as "selection of a number of copies, copy conditions, paper size selection, etc." Regarding this statement, it is noted that such copy conditions and paper size selections are taught by Miyachi. See Table 1, especially column 6, line 60 through column 7, line 35.
- 14. In further support of the argument the applicant has stated that "One objective of the present invention is to monitor such data so that a user's usage of an operation panel can be evaluated, so that the setup, layout, control, etc. of an operation panel of an image forming device can be improved." However, such evaluation and improvement steps are not limitations of the claims. The applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- 15. In addition, the applicant has argued that claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103, but not explicitly discussed, are allowable based on the above arguments. Thus,

Art Unit: 2152

claims disclosing similar limitations to the discussed claims and related dependent claims remain rejected under the same reasoning as presented above.

#### Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** The applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Victor Lesniewski Patent Examiner Group Art Unit 2152

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER